REMARKS

Claims 1-19 have been examined. New claims 20-28 have been added to further describe the patentable features of the present invention.

I. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims have been amended more clearly recite the features of the present invention. Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection in view of the self-explanatory claim amendments made herein.

II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-9, 18 and 19 have been rejected because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection in view of the self-explanatory claim amendments made herein.

III. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

In view of Fujimura

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as allegedly being anticipated by Fujimura et al. (hereinafter Fujimura): U.S. Patent No. 6,778,756. Applicants traverse this rejection as follows.

A. Claim 1

Claim 1 recites:

> A scroll display control device including a computer readable medium which stores a program for causing a computer to execute scroll-displaying, in synchronism with reproduction of series information correlated to text information, the corresponding text information on a text display screen, said scroll display control device comprising:
>
> means which changes a scroll speed in said text display screen **on the basis of a text quantity of said corresponding text information with respect to reproduction time of said series information**. (emphasis added).

The Examiner asserts that Fujimura discloses each and every feature of claim 1. In particular, the Examiner asserts that column 13, lines 30-58, of Fujimura discloses that the scrolling speed is determined according to the number of characters/text quantity and the countdown for recording of narration on video, which corresponds to reproduction time of video/series information. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's position.

Fujimura discloses that the scrolling speed may be decided in advance, like a predetermined number of characters per second (col. 13, lines 38-40). However, a "number of characters per second" is merely the scroll speed itself, and is not a representation of the actual text quantity of the text information. That is, Fujimura merely discloses pre-setting the scroll speed to a particular rate (e.g., the number of characters per second) but does not disclose changing the scroll speed on the basis of a text quantity of the corresponding text information.

Furthermore, Fujimura discloses that the narrator may control the scrolling speed (manually) from the outside of the text video generation unit (col. 13, lines 40-41). Thus, Fujimura merely suggests that a person may manually increase or decrease the scrolling speed by changing the number of characters per second that scroll across the monitor. Again, this is not

equivalent to changing the scroll speed on the basis of a text quantity of the corresponding text information, as recited in claim 1.

In addition, Fujimura fails to disclose changing the scroll speed on the basis of a text quantity of said corresponding text information with respect to reproduction time of said series information. Fujimura discloses that a text video signal is generated when the time information supplied from the reproduction unit 51 reaches a time of a predetermined period before a countdown end time which has been previously set (col. 12, lines 23-32 and col. 13, lines 1-20). That is, Fujimura merely discloses a time when a text video signal is generated according to a time before a countdown ends. The time for the generation of the text video signal is previously set. The sections of Fujimura noted above, however, do not relate to a changing of the scrolling speed in the text display screen on the basis of a text quantity of the corresponding text information with respect to reproduction time of the series information.

In view of the above, Fujimura does not disclose or fairly suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable for at least this reason.

B. Claim 10

Claim 10 recites:

> A scroll display control method comprising:
> displaying text information corresponding to sound in a scroll manner, such that the text information is displayed in synchronism with **reproduction of the sound** by changing a scroll speed adaptable to the sound **during reproduction**. (emphasis added).

Applicants submit that claim 10 is patentable for reasons similar to those presented above in conjunction with claim 10.

In addition, Fujimura fails to disclose displaying text information in a scroll manner such that the text information is displayed in synchronism with reproduction of the sound...during

reproduction. Fujimura discloses a countdown audio generation unit for generating a countdown audio signal which informs the user of a predetermined time by using countdown audio (col. 1, lines 7-10 and 54-67). In other words, the "audio" merely relates to a recitation of a countdown to notify a user that the end of a video is approaching.

In a separate feature, Fujimura discloses generating a text audio signal and synthesizing the text video signal with the reproduced video signal (col. 2, lines 10-20, col. 12, lines 23-32 and col. 13, lines 30-48). However, Fujimura does not disclose any relationship between the text video signal and the audio itself, and more particularly, between the text video signal and the reproduction of the sound (i.e., the countdown audio). Furthermore, Fujimura does not disclose changing the scroll speed **adaptable** to the sound during reproduction of the sound. Fujimura merely discloses that the scrolling speed may be decided in advance, like a predetermined number of characters per second (col. 13, lines 38-40). Setting a scroll speed to a pre-set rate is not equivalent to changing the scroll speed **adaptable** to the sound during reproduction of the sound. Fujimura fails to disclose the scroll speed being adaptable to the sound. Also, since Fujimura discloses that he scroll speed is set in advance, Fujimura fails to disclose that the changing of the scroll speed is **adaptable** to the sound **during reproduction of the sound**. There is simply no disclosure in Fujimura regarding changing the scroll speed adaptable to the sound during reproduction of the sound (e.g., the reproduction of the countdown audio).

In view of the above, Fujimura does not disclose or fairly suggest each and every feature of claim 10. Therefore, claim 10 is patentable for at least this reason.

In view of Rosen

The Examiner has rejected claims 11-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as allegedly being anticipated by Rosen et al. (hereinafter Rosen): U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0201610. Applicants traverse this rejection as follows.

A. Claim 11

Claim 11 recites:

> A scroll display control method comprising:
> displaying and reading text information corresponding to a picture in synchronism with reproduction of the picture in a scrolling manner, and performing scroll display of said text information **in synchronism** with the reproduction of the picture by **changing a scroll speed adaptable to the picture under reproduction**.

The Examiner asserts that Rosen discloses each and every feature of claim 11. In particular, the Examiner asserts paragraphs 24, 26, 30 and 163 of Rosen disclose displaying text data corresponding to the image/picture with changing a scroll speed by means of various speed control. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's position.

According to paragraph 24 of Rosen, Rosen discloses that during a first presentation, such as a video, displayed in a main window 150, a user may select a shortcut slide/box 151 corresponding to a second presentation, such as text, to be displayed in the main window 150. FIG. 6 illustrates a content shell 51 having only a main window 150 for displaying content (e.g., video or text). Thus, the first presentation ends when the second presentation begins. Rosen also discloses that **if** the second presentation is text, the user may (manually) be able to use scrolling, paging and other text control buttons (paragraph 24).

However, Rosen fails to disclose displaying and reading text information corresponding to a picture in synchronism with reproduction of the picture in a scrolling manner. That is the

scrolling of text information in Rosen is not in synchronism with the reproduction of a picture. For example, the scrolling disclosed in paragraph 24 of Rosen merely relates to a manual control by a user to scroll text in a second presentation. Rosen fails to disclose any synchronization between the scrolling of the text and the reproduction of a picture. More particularly, the mere manual operation of a user to scroll text in main window 150 is not a performance of scroll display of said text information **in synchronism** with the reproduction of the picture by **changing a scroll speed adaptable to the picture under reproduction.** Rosen makes no mention of changing a scroll speed adaptable to the picture under reproduction such that scroll display of the text information is performed in synchronism with the reproduction of the picture. Again, the mere disclosure of scrolling by a user does not disclose the above features of claim 11.

In addition, the Examiner asserts that paragraphs 26, 30 and 163 of Rosen disclose various speed controls for changing a scroll speed. Paragraphs 26, 30 and 163 of Rosen merely relate to video controls for controlling video and not to text controlling buttons or controls to perform a scrolling of text. Rosen does not disclose any relationship between the video controls disclosed in paragraphs 26, 30 and 163 and the text control buttons recited in paragraph 24. Further, Rosen does not disclose any relationship between the video controls and the synchronization of a scroll display of text information with the reproduction of the picture by changing a scroll speed adaptable to the picture under reproduction.

The Examiner's reliance on paragraphs 26, 30 and 163 is insufficient to meet the requirements of claim 11 since it is directed to an embodiment unrelated to paragraph 24 and thus is the combination of unrelated embodiments without justification. Two embodiments in a single reference may not be combined absent specific teaching. *In re Kramer*, 18 USPQ2d 1415,

1416 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *Ex parte Beuther*, 71 USPQ2d 1313, 1316 (BPAI 2003). In fact, since Rosen discloses separate and distinct means for manually controlling video and for manually performing scrolling, there does not appear to be any suggestion that scroll display of said text information in synchronism with the reproduction of the picture is performed by changing a scroll speed adaptable to the picture under reproduction, as required by claim 11.

In view of the above, Rosen does not disclose or fairly suggest each and every feature of claim 11. Therefore, claim 11 is patentable for at least this reason.

B. Claim 12

Claim 12 recites that "the text information to be displayed is text information belonging to a text section corresponding to the picture during reproduction and to preceding and succeeding text sections thereof." The Examiner cites paragraph 26 of Rosen for disclosing this feature. In particular, the Examiner asserts that paragraph 26 discloses displaying text data during play and forward control function. However, paragraph 26 relates to video controls and not to the displaying of text sections, and more particularly, to ext sections including (1) a text section corresponding to the picture during reproduction, (2) a preceding text section thereof, and (3) a succeeding text section thereof. Applicants submit that Rosen fails to disclose the features of claim 12, and therefore, claim 12 should be patentable for at least this reason.

C. Claim 13

Claim 13 recites "when a text section corresponding to a picture reproduction position is changed, said scroll speed is derived on the basis of a time length of a picture section corresponding to the picture reproduction position and a text quantity of the text section corresponding to the picture reproduction position." The Examiner asserts that paragraph 11 of Rosen discloses the above features. In particular, the Examiner asserts that paragraph 11

discloses controlling the scroll speed by times frames and content of text documents. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Paragraph 11 of Rosen discloses that slides are associated with certain times or frames of the video and tangential content is retrieved for each slide. However, in view of paragraph 24, Rosen merely discloses controlling a scroll speed of text by using text control buttons. In paragraph 26, Rosen merely discloses controlling video by using video controls. Paragraph 11 of Rosen at best discloses that associated tangential content is related to a certain frame. Rosen, however , does not disclose that a scroll speed is derived on the basis of a time length of a picture section corresponding to the picture reproduction position **and** a text quantity of the text section corresponding to the picture reproduction position. Rosen fails to provide any disclosure on how the scroll speed is derived other than from the manual operation of the user using controls. Rosen fails to disclose taking into account a time length of a picture section corresponding to the picture reproduction position **and** a text quantity of the text section corresponding to the picture reproduction position for deriving the scroll speed.

In view of the above, Rosen does not disclose or fairly suggest each and every feature of claim 13. Therefore, claim 13 is patentable for at least this reason.

D. Claim 14

Applicants submit that claim 14 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependencies on claims 11 and 13. In addition, Applicants submit that claim 14 is patentable for reasons similar to those presented above in conjunction with claims 11 and 13.

E. Claim 15

Applicants submit that claim 15 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

F. Claims 16 and 17

Claim 16 recites that "the text quantity of the text section is increased by changing the text display setting when reproduction of the picture is either fast-forward reproduction of at least two-time fast-forward reproduction or rewind reproduction." Rosen fails to disclose changing a text display setting of the text. That is, controlling a fast forward of a video does not correlate into changing a text display setting such that the text quantity of the text section is increased. Rosen does not disclose increasing a text quantity of the text section.

Similarly, Rosen fails to disclose the features of claim 17. Furthermore, Rosen does not indicate that a text section succeeding the text section corresponding to the picture under reproduction **is increased** by changing the text display setting when reproduction of the picture is slow reproduction. Examiner fails to show how operating an image in slow image correlates into increasing a text section succeeding the text section corresponding to the picture under reproduction. Applicants submit that Rosen fails to teach this feature.

IV. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 2-9, 18 and 19 as allegedly being unpatentable over Fujimura in view of Randall et al. (hereinafter Randall): U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2003/0090507. Applicants traverse this rejection as follows.

A. Claims 2, 18 and 19

Randall fails to correct the deficiencies of Fujimura in view of claims 1 and 10. That is, claim 2 recites "scroll speed calculation means which calculates a scroll speed on the basis of at least a time length of a series information section presently under reproduction and a quantity of the text belonging to a text section corresponding to the series information section during reproduction," which the Examiner asserts is taught by Fujimura for similar reasons which are

the basis for the Examiner's rejections for claim 1 and 10. Thus, Applicants submit that Fujimura, alone or in combination with Randall, fails to teach or suggest the features of claim 2 for reasons similar to those presented above in conjunction with claims 1 and 10. More specifically, the cited art fails to teach or suggest a scroll speed calculation means which calculates a scroll speed on the basis of at least a time length of a series information section presently under reproduction and a quantity of the text belonging to a text section corresponding to the series information section during reproduction.

Claims 18 and 19 are also patentable for similar reasons.

B. Claims 3, 4, 6 and 8

The Examiner also asserts that Fujimura teaches the features of claims 3, 4, 6 and 8. However, claim 3 is also patentable for reasons similar to those presented above in conjunction with claim 1. Also, claims 4, 6 and 8 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

C. Claims 5, 7 and 9

Claim 5 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 3. That is, Randall fails to correct the deficiencies of Fujimura with respect to claims 2 and 3.

Claim 7 recites that "text of a preceding text section which precedes the text section and text of a succeeding text section which succeeds the text section are respectively displayed in two adjacent areas across the text section displayed at the reference position." That is, in view of claim 2, a text display screen displays (1) text belonging to the text section corresponding to the series information section during reproduction (i.e., text section displayed at the reference position), (2) text of a preceding text section which precedes the text section, and (3) text of a succeeding text section which succeeds the text section. Figure 1 of Randall at best shows a text

section in the teleprompter 20 which corresponds to the series information (i.e., the video) displayed in preview/review area 10. Figure 1 of Randall, however, does not teach or suggest that text of a preceding text section which precedes the text section and text of a succeeding text section which succeeds the text section are respectively displayed in two adjacent areas across the text section displayed at the reference position, as recited in claim 7.

Also, Figure 1 illustrates an "action area" 40 which is a predetermined area of the screen where text within is spoken out load (paragraphs 10 and 27). As seen in Figure 1, however, no text is illustrated preceding the "action area" 40.

Therefore, claim 7 is patentable for at least these reasons.

Claim 9 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 2. That is, Randall fails to correct the deficiencies of Fujimura with respect to claim 2.

IV. New claims

By this Amendment, Applicants have added new claims 20-28 to further define the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit claims 20-28 recite additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Ryan F. Heavener
Registration No. 61,512

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 11, 2008